DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 560 EA 021 331

AUTHOR Stoloff, David L.
TITLE Building Educational Communities: Academic Partnerships in Canada and in the United States.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (Cambridge, MA, March 31-April 2, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Boards of Education; Community Control; *Community Involvement; *Community Schools; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *International Cooperation; Interprofessional Relationship; Public Agencies
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *United States

ABSTRACT

This document examines how Ministries/Departments of Education in Canada and the United States build community-ownership of schools. Common and novel strategies for building educational communities are also discussed using Eisler's "gylanic" society paradigm. Individuals within governmental agencies that work at developing collaborative efforts between the different segments of the educational enterprise were identified. Twenty-five respondents from 11 nations commented on a questionnaire about how their governmental agency encourages cooperative efforts. Responses from Canada and the United States are highlighted along with a review of selected literature on educational cooperation and organization in these two neighboring nations. Findings indicate that the departments of education in Canada and in the United States engender cooperation among precollegiate schools through financial support, systemwide standardization of curriculum, and cosponsorship of community programs. Encouragement of school-university cooperation usually proceeds through indirect channels or through short-term, specially funded projects. (10 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311560

Building Educational Communities:

Academic Partnerships in Canada and in the United States

Dr. David L. Stoloff, Associate Professor,
Division of Ed'l. Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
School of Education, California State University, LA

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the Comparative and International Education Society
in Harvard University, March 31 - April 2, 1989.

This paper presentation was partially supported
by grants from
the California Academic Partnership Program,
the National Science Foundation-sponsored
Southern California ACCESS Centers and Network, and
the School of Education, Cal. State, LA.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Stoloff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 331

ABSTRACT

How do educational institutions interact to create a community of interests and goals for schools, classrooms, and pedagogy? This presentation examines how Ministries/ Departments of Education in Canada and the United States build community-ownership of schools. Common and novel strategies for building educational communities are also discussed using Eisler's (1986) "gylanic" society paradigm.

How do governmental agencies in Canada and the United States encourage communication among educational and community institutions to increase cooperation? If as current metaphors suggest, education is a seam-less web, a lifelong process, or a pipeline from early childhood to professional/avocational life, how do politically distinct organizations -- such as schools, universities, commerical enterprises, and other community organizations -- cooperate to aid individuals to fulfill their instrumental and sentimental goals and aspirations?

Partnerships within and among the different segments of a nation's educational system may require some encouragement from a governmental coordinating agency. Partnerships between school and universities may need external incentives for as Goodlad (1988) suggests "schools of education have not yet generally embraced the notion that it is important for them to be closely involved with the problems of the schools." In schools, there also appears to be "no great enthusiasm on the part of many school administrators to be closely involved with neighboring universities." Shanker (1988) and Futrell (1988) describes this need for a

partnership between teachers and administrators within schools. Shanker, the current President of the American Federation of Teachers, states that in a successful partnership, "those who are affected by decisions and who must live with the results are the ones who actually make the decisions." Futrell, the current President of the National Education Association, concludes that "only through a mutual respect rooted in understanding and empathy will we, teachers and administrators, gain the strength and wisdom to accomplish the tasks before us." Schlechty and Whitford (1988) add that successful collaborations require an educational leadership that articulates a shared vision of the future.

Governmental Ministries or Departments of Education are empowered by their political systems to provide educational leadership. During the Summer of 1988, the author sought to identify individuals within these governmental agencies that work at developing collaborative efforts between the different segments of the Educational Enterprise. A questionaire was sent to "Personnel interested in School/University Cooperation, State Department/Ministry of Education," addressed to each of the State Capitals in the United States, to the Provincial Capitals in Canada, and to the National Capitals in all of the United Nations member nations plus several non-member nations. The questionaire asked the respondents to comment on how their governmental

agency encourages copperative efforts among Public/Private Pre-collegiate Schools, among Colleges and Universities, between Schools and Colleges/Universities, with other Community Resources -- including Broadcasting/Information Disseminating Agencies, Military/Governmental Units, and Community Social/Cultural Groups, and across international boundaries. The survey was designed to develop a catalog of model collaborative efforts in education and to generate a database network of national and international educators leading collaborative efforts. By November 1988, this open-ended questionaire returned 25 respondents from 11 nations (Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Grenada, Luxembourg, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuvalu, and the United States), including 8 U.S. states (Alabama, California, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina) and 2 Canadian provinces (Nova Scotia and Alberta). Stoloff (1988) summarizes the survey responses. In this paper, the responses from Canada and the United States are highlighted along with a review of selected literature on educational cooperation and organization in these two neighboring nations.

COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

The structure and function of the educational systems in Canada and in the United States may influence the possibilities of educational cooperation between schools and their communities. These two North American nations share

a common boundary and several societal processes descendant from the British colonial and western European traditions of education and of community. How the evolution of education has diverged in these two nations may manifest the cultural uniqueness of the Canadian and United States experiences.

Federal Involvement in Education Both the federal governments in Ottawa and Washington have limited direct involvement in most educational settings. Sheffield et. al. (1982) report that in a review of Canadian Education, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) found no national policy for education in Canada. The OECD reviewers wrote that

> Canada has trodden out its own path, with an array of exceptionally active programs for vast quantitiative expansion and significant qualitative change of the education system that are, however, derived from no explicitly stated, overall national conception of thje country's interests...Canadian educational development has exhibited in its rapid growth a high degree of enterpreneurial risk-taking behavior, as well as openness, flexibility, and the capacity for improvisation. The comparison might be a little less favorable to Canada, only if one thinks of the spirit of coordination, cooperation, and rationalization that is also demanded of modern, large-scale enterpreneurs.

The Federal Department of Education in the United States also does not have an well-articulated national policy on education. Unlike most nations of the world with National Ministries of Education, both Canada and the US, by tradition and by law, have delegated the responsiblities for most education to the state and local level.

The federal governments do have responsibilities for the education of indigenous people in treaty or reservation-reserve schools and for some of the dependents of Armed Forces personnel overseas. Both nations have guaranteed some post-secondary student loans and maintain agencies that gather and analyze statistics on education. Limited federal funding for educational research and local curriculum development projects are also available through national grant competitions.

The federal governments do also play an indirect, proactive role in several of that nation's major educational issues. The Canadian Educational Association (CEA, 1984) reports that the federal government provides support to official minority and second language education through the Official Languages in Education Program. The Multiculturalism Directorate of the Secretary of State Department provides financial assistance for heritage language programs in "supplementary" after-school programs. The Education Support Program of the Secretary of State Department contributes to post-secondary education through grants to the provincial Ministries of Education. The Canadian Federal Government also provides funding to postsecondary education through block grants based on enrollment figures to the provinces.

In the United States, the federal government provides block grants directly to state Departments of Education for

bilingual education, compensatory education, and school nutrition. The federal government has also selected and supported university-school cooperative efforts in curriculum development and action research in reaction to the crucial needs for trained personnel in science and technology fields and for reducing the number of "dropouts". For example, the National Science Foundation-supported Southern California ACCESS Centers and Network is designed to create a community of science educators dedicated to increasing the number of students, from groups currently underrepresented, in science and technology graduate studies and careers. The U.S. Department of Education also supports Project SUPPoRT, a program designed to improve the success rates of students identified as at-risk for "dropping out" of high school.

From lunch programs to school busses, other ministry-level Secretariats are concerned with a wide range of educational services. National policies are implied by these small levels of support for key issues to local schools, but federal influence on the totality of local educational programs is minimal. Even with these various programs, the total federal commitment to education in either nation has not exceeded 10% of the precollegiate school funding provided by state/provincial or local sources. Both national systems lack a coordinated policy

on educational community development and on the distribution of a relatively small amount of financial resources.

Pre-Collegiate Educational Cooperation In most states and provinces, the Ministry or Department of Education controls most of school funding and therefore is in position to establish a uniform expectancy level across schools that allows for mobility and comparison across the system. Local educational authorities in Canada and the United States seem to be most easily involved with efforts to encourage cooperation between pre-collegiate schools. The Provincial Department of Education in Nova Scotia and in other states and provinces continue this support through financial assistance to School Board Associations, Home and School Federations, and in-service programs for teachers and local school boards.

One major difference between this local support in Canada and in the United States is how educational diversity is accomodated (CEA, 1984). Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Newfoundland, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories provide financial support for both public and separate, denominational schools. In Quebec, the public school system is controlled by either local Catholic and Protestant school commissions. Manitoba, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island provide direct support for non-sectarian public education. Some

after-school heritage programs are sponsored through federal grants in these and the other provinces.

Quebec's system of separate Catholic and Protestant school commissions reflects most strikingly this major difference in educational organization, when compared to pre-collegiate education in the United States and in Canada. As an outgrowth of the religious differences between the French and English settler populations in the eighteenth century, these confessional schools have developed from parish and rector controlled adjuncts of the community into parallel school administrative units. The language of instruction within these units also reflects history. The Catholic school commission primarily employs French, while the Protestant school commission employs English. In the urban centers of Montreal, these denominational school commissions have been internally divided by language, creating within the Catholic school commission a smaller group of schools where English was the language of instruction and within the Protestant school commission an even smaller group of schools with French as <<la langue scolaire>>.

These school organizational strategies have engendered a good deal of local discussion and political activity within local communities. With the renewed emphasis on French as the first language of Quebec since 1976, local immigrant communities have rallied around teachers in the English

Catholic system to create elementary school classes with English as the language of instruction. These classes, of children from homes where Portuguese, Greek, Italian, Yiddish, and other languages are the maternal languages, are encouraged to study English, by their communities, and French, by their government. This conflict between the wishes of the Quebec government and the local immigrant communities over language learning generates a great deal of political activity but little actual change in the use of English as the language of instruction in this minority of officially illegal classrooms. Although stressing the importance of French language instruction, the Quebec government has also supported educational diversity by providing grants to some private schools.

In the past few years, with a decline in allegiance to either of the religious groupings, parents and community leaders have suggested that perhaps the school commissions should organized along language groupings primarily. Arnold (1989) reports that when Bill 107, the new legislation replacing Quebec's former Education Act, is enacted in July 1989, each individual school will be required to set up "orientation committees" that will recommend the confessional status of the school to the school board. These orientation committees, composed of teachers, a representative of the non-teaching staff, high school students, and at least as many parents as there are

other voting members, will determine the specific objectives of educational project of the school. The institution of these orientation committees at each school is seen as a step along the way of establishing school commissions grouped by language, instead of religion.

Collegiate Cooperation A major difference between Canadian and U.S. higher education is the strategies implemented for higher education coordination and community development. Sheffield et. al. (1982) describe the use of intermediary higher education coordinating bodies to advise on university allocations and objectives. Of the ten provinces, six have governmental departments with responsibility for all levels of education, including postsecondary education. The four other provinces have special governmental departments for higher education. In Nova Scotia, the universities are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Advanced Education and Job Training and indirectly influenced by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission, the Nova Scotia Council on Higher Education, and the Association of Atlantic Universities. In Quebec and in Ontario, intermediary councils are advisory with respect to the allocation of funds to the universities, while those in the Maritime provinces and Manitoba, Saskatshewan, and British Columbia delegate this authority to other commissions. These provincial coordinating councils for higher education do not directly determine

allocations, which is a governmental perogative. Proposed new program of studies at a university or community college in Ontario or Quebec, for example, must be approved directly by a legislative committee. Such centralized control of higher education leads to more awareness among the various colleges and universities in a province on the programs and enrollment patterns across campuses.

In both Canada and the United States, sporting competitions among university athletic departments are coordinated by national councils. Outside accreditation associations play some role in the standardization of the role of higher education. Yet in the United States, there is often little govermental connections among the universities within a state or across statelines. Many states have coordinating bodies, Regents, that oversee the development of programs and funding allocations within state-funded universities. Communications and coordination with communities colleges, private colleges and universities, and with pre-collegiate education is most often not formalized or extensive.

There have been initial efforts at coordinating pre-collegiate and post-secondary education in some states. The California Postsecondary Education Commission has also been instrumental in convening an Intersegmental Coordination Council to develop articulation strategies between community colleges, private schools, precollegiate

school districts, and the two state-funded university systems. In the State of New Mexico, their Commission on Higher Education and a junior college consortium has called for maximizing efficiency through cooperation. With these initial initiatives, the influence of advisory State Master Plans for Education, movements for intercollegiate cooperation, and changes in the student body demographics, higher educational community development may be seen as a growing priority in the next decade.

School-University Cooperation Under the direct influence on pre-collegiate education of Ministries/ Departments of Education and their indirect influence on postsecondary education, governments tend to create short-term specially funded projects to coordinate communication across these two segments. In Nova Scotia, the Department of Education helps coordinate a Provincial Education Week by preparing materials for schools and media on educational opportunities. In New Mexico, the 1988 state legislature passed a memorial calling for a study on the issue of school-university cooperation and encourages a close working relationship between the State Department of Education and the Commission on Higher Education. The University and College (UCO) Program and the California Academic Partnership Program are two programs in California designed to increase the number of minority students prepared to succeed in higher education by encouraging

liaisons between high school staff and postsecondary education institutions.

Educational Cooperation with Community Resources

Educational partnerships with other community resources seem to be highly encouraged by governmental agenices. Nova Scotia operate publication and reference divisions for Education that disseminate media to the general public on a regular basis. In Nova Scotia, the Deputy Minister of Education is also active on the Joint Human Rights and Education Committee that discusses issues of human rights that impinge on the public education system. The Nova Scotia Department of Education is also represented within intra-national organizations on special education, the use of educational technology, and multicultural education.

Other respondents stressed their agencies involvement in encouraging cooperative efforts between schools, business, and industry. The Ohio Department of Education has developed numerous school/business/industry partnership programs that have incorporated an extensive network of support volunteers. In New Mexico, the Department of Education has designated an individual to foster school-business partnerships.

The Calgary Board of Education and Alberta Education co-sponsored the "First Canadian Symposium on Partnerships in Education" in the Fall of 1988 with such topics as building a caring society, what do students need to learn

and how can partnerships help, and partnerships and the future. The Calgary (Alberta) Board of Education, the San Mateo County Office of Education, the Kansas Foundation for Partnerships in Education, and the Hawaii, California, and Alabama Departments of Education all report active Adopt-a-School Partnerships between local businesses, industries, and schools. In evaluation their Partnerships in Education program, a pairing of local businesses and organizations with a public school on the basis of needs and school priorities, the Calgary Board of Education found that their partnerships had the following effects:

* improved student learning.
* improved teacher effectiveness.
* more equitable and improved access to quality educational opportunities.
* enhanced flexibility.
* improved school access to additional resources.
* greater incentives for positive change.
* enhanced use of technology in the learning process.
* improved understanding and support of education.
* assisted teachers and guidance counselors.

The evaluation study also conclude that a full-time person was needed to coordinate the partnerships; teachers' roles in the partnership, program purposes for student learning, and policies related to volunteer time away from the workplace need to be clarified; training for school and business coordinators is needed; and partnerships should be reassess on a regular basis; and that a process for ending a partnership should be formulated.

International Cooperative Efforts Governmental educational agencies most often develop or sponsor international cooperative efforts through small scale projects such as the "twinning" of schools across international boundaries. For example, the Department of Education in Nova Scotia participates in teacher exchange programs with the United States, the United Kingdom, and several European nations. Using educational technology, the Hawaii's State Department of Education has formal agreements within the Pacific Circle Consortium to share educational resources and informal partnerships between individual schools or within subject area through TELEclass, a system of 100 international contacts through telecommunication satellites between Hawaii and several nations. ACCESS, Alberta's educational television network, and TV Ontario provide high-quality instructional television to classrooms throughout North America.

CONCLUSIONS

Ministries/Departments of Education in Canada and the United States through their financial support, the system-wide standardization of curriculum, and co-sponsoring community programs engender cooperation among pre-collegiate schools. Since post-secondary education is not often under the direct influence of the Ministries/Departments of Education, encouragement of school-university cooperation usually proceeds through indirect channels or through

short-term, specially funded projects. Ministries/ Departments of Education play more direct roles in encouraging cooperation between community resources and individual schools and other intra-international educational agencies. The survey responses also suggest that several diverse educational systems have already established strategies to increase collaboration between schools, universities, and the communities they serve.

Following a Comparative Education review of Other Schools and Ours, King (1979) suggests that the "expansion of learning, the pace of its development, and the systematic utilization not only of applied science but of its opportunities in the social field, require the partnership [King's emphasis] of many people not so far considered even as participants in the educational process." Parents, students, and community experts may need an increased role in the decision-making of the educational institutions to increase the strength of the partnership. King suggests that a third idiom, or phase, of education is arising due to educational technology. This emerging theme in education "represents a repudiation of the previous authority system"...and "puts far more emphasis on sharing, on concern, and on judgment."

Education as a communal function depends on the structure and goals of society. Within a community, whether in the United States or other nations, involvement

in education and educational collaborations are developed and nurtured at different times for different goals. As King suggests, new ways of delivering and making sense of ever-increasing amounts of information may influence the structure and function of education and cooperation in the future.

Eisler (1987) describes a "partnership" society prior to the "dominator" societies detailed in written history. This partnership society is characterized by Eisler to be devoted to individual actualization, with men and women playing equal, powerful roles in affiliation. Eisler suggests the word, "gylany", to describe these communities. Gylany represents neither matriarchy nor patriarchy, but the linkages of men and women in a purposeful society without hierarchies based on the threat of force. Education in these partnership, gylanic societies is by a process of individual nurturing and discovery by one's own pace. Eisler predicts that we are on the verge of a return to these partnership societies of the forgotten past. As the partnership society replaces the present dominator, hierarchial society, Eisler expects that all cooperative activities will be appropriately valued and rewarded and that education and "the life-formative years will be the active concern of both women and men." Learning in this partnership society "rather than being designed to socialize a child to adjust to her or his place in a world of rank

orderings," will be "a lifelong process for maximizing flexibility and creativity at all stages of life."

King and Eisler suggest that a structural change in the delivery of education and an attitudinal change about the process of education may increase the amount of educational cooperation. The stress in current education on hierarchies, specific subject-matter domains, and segmental integrity has hindered the cooperative efforts of professional educators in the past. These writers believe that a paradigm shift on the nature and function of education would provide the environment for lifelong learning and greater societal communications and understanding.

The central issue of creating a common vision of the future among diverse educational authorities with divergent client populations must first be resolved before educational partnerships may be developed to fruition. The importance of developing trusting relationships though long-term contacts among individuals from the different educational segments in the partnerships was stressed by the respondents of this survey. Governmental agencies serve best as the common ground between these educators as they seek to define and reach common goals. Only when these common goals are developed and pursued will education reach a unity of purpose and truly become a lifelong seamless web for all individuals in society.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This national/international survey was partially supported by the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP), a state-funded project to encourage School-University cooperative efforts to increase the number of under-represented minority students in post-secondary education. This report arose from the author's interest, as Project Director of the Academic Partnership in Science Education/a CAPP project and as an participant in the California Roundtable's Intersegmental Coordinating Council, in gathering information on innovative techniques in building common agendas across the different educational segments.

The respondents to this survey included J.W. Rollings, Rose Talley-Holloway, and A.R. Little of the California State Dept. of Education; Penny Edgert of the California Postsecondary Education Commission; Denard W. Davis of the Merced (CA) County Office of Education; Sharon Niederhaus of the San Mateo (CA) County Office of Ed.; Al Zamora and Laine Renfro of the New Mexico State Dept. of Education; Curt Matthews of the Maryland State Dept. of Education; Loritta T. Myles of the Ohio Dept. of Ed.; Kellet I. Min of the Hawaii Dept. of Ed.; Anita G. Barber of the Alabama State Dept. of Ed.; Diana J. Ashworth of the South Carolina Dept. of Ed.; Richard P. Russell of the Kansas State Department of Ed.; Guy C. Pothier of the Nova Scotia Dept. of Ed.; and Russell Sawchuk of Alberta Education. The author thanks the respondents for their timely responses and willingness to be part of an International Partnership Network. The reader is invited to join this network by contacting the author c/o the Division of Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies, California State University, Los Angeles, CA 90032.

REFERENCES

Arnold, Janice. "'Jewish' Schools within Public System Possible." The Canadian Jewish News, February 16, 1989, pg. 20.

Canadian Education Association. An Overview of Canadian Education: Third Edition. Toronto: CEA, 1984.

Eisler, Raine. The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Futrell, Mary Hatwood. "The Importance of Partnership." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 74-75.

Goodlad, John I. "School-University Partnerships: A Social

Experiment." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 77-80.

King, Edmund J. Other Schools and Ours: Comparative Studies for Today: Fifth Edition. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979, pp. 42-44.

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Whitford, Betty Lou. "Types and Characteristics of School-University Collaboration." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 81-83.

Shanker, Albert. "Partnerships between Teachers and Administrators: How 'They' Became 'We'." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 72-73.

Sheffield, Edward; Campbell, Duncan D.; Holmes, Jeffrey; Kymlicka, B.B.; and Whitelaw, James H. Systems of Higher Education: Canada. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1982.

Stoloff, David L. "Encouraging Educational Intra-Communications: Governmental Support for Educational Cooperation." A paper presented at the Western Regional Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Sacramento, CA, October 21-22, 1988.